

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

The claims are modified in the amendment. More specifically, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 25, 29, 30, and 32 have been amended. Claims 1-36 are still present for examination. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection - Bloch et al. alone and in view of Landsman et al.

The final Office Action has rejected claims 1-12 and 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0129129 to Bloch et al. (hereinafter "Bloch"). Further, the final Office Action has rejected claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,451 to Landsman et al. (hereinafter "Landsman"). Applicant believes that a *prima facie* showing obviousness has not been properly set forth as claim limitations are not expressly or implicitly taught in the references. Further, proper motivation to combine these teachings is not set forth.

Limitations Not Implicit

In the Office Action, limitations are implied without proper support. It is not clear if these limitations are taken under Official Notice, but if so an express showing of documentary proof is hereby requested for these missing limitations as the documentary proof procedure is set forth in MPEP 2144.03. A limitation can only be implied as a teaching from a reference if that limitation necessarily follows from what is expressed in a reference. On page 3, lines 1-3, the Office Action states that a header includes version information as some sort of statement of fact. This is not necessarily true as valid XML and HTML does not require use of a version identifier. The logic chain breaks in the Office Action's argument at this point. The argument in the second paragraph of page 5, suffers the same flaw.

Apparent Official Notice for Motives to Combine

In the Office Action, there appears to be reliance on Official Notice for motivations to combine as no cite to a reference for the propositions set forth can be found. More specifically, there is apparent Official Notice used in the first paragraph of page 3, second paragraph of page 5, and second paragraph of page 6. If a cite for these propositions cannot be set forth, an express showing of documentary proof is hereby requested as the procedure is set forth in MPEP 2144.03.

Reconsideration Requested

In view of the missing limitations and lack of proper motive to combine, reconsideration is respectfully requested of the application as amended.

Interview Request

Should further action be required before allowance of this application, Applicant hereby requests an interview. The subject matter of this application is complex and discussing the issues before further action would be helpful in any further prosecution. The undersigned can be reached by telephone at 303-571-4000.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas D. Franklin
Reg. No. 43,616

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
TDF:cmb

60842944 v1